

The bulk kinetic power of the jets of GRS 1915+105

M. Gliozzi¹, G. Bodo² & G. Ghisellini³

¹ *Dipartimento di Fisica Generale di Torino, Via P.Giuria, I-10125 Torino, Italy*

² *Osservatorio Astronomico di Torino, Strada Osservatorio 20, I-10025 Pino Torinese, Italy*

³ *Osservatorio Astronomico di Brera, V. Bianchi, 46, I-23807 Merate, Italy*

1 February 2008

ABSTRACT

We calculate the minimum value of the power in kinetic bulk motion of the galactic superluminal source GRS 1915+105. This value far exceeds the Eddington luminosity for accretion onto a black hole of 10 solar masses. This large value severely limits the possible carriers of the kinetic luminosity at the base of the jet, and favours a jet production and acceleration controlled by a magnetic field whose value, at the base of the jet, exceeds 10^8 Gauss. The Blandford and Znajek process can be responsible of the extraction of the rotational energy of a Kerr black hole, if lasting long enough to provide the required kinetic energy. This time, of the order of a day, implies that the process must operate in a stationary, not impulsive, mode.

Key words: radiative processes: nonthermal — stars: individual GRS 1915+105

1 INTRODUCTION

GRS 1915+105 was discovered in 1992 with the WATCH telescope on board the GRANAT satellite (Castro-Tirado et al. 1992). A radio counterpart was subsequently identified and bipolar outflows with apparent superluminal motions were observed; the standard interpretation of this phenomenon in terms of relativistic jets (Rees 1966) places the source at a distance $D=12.5$ kpc at an angle $i = 70^\circ$ to the line of sight (Mirabel & Rodriguez 1994). The source cannot be observed in the optical band, due to the heavy extinction in the Galactic plane, but the X-ray luminosity often well above the Eddington luminosity for a neutron star suggests the presence of a ~ 10 solar mass black hole. Other circumstantial evidence comes with the similarities with the other galactic superluminal source GRO J1655–40, which has been shown unambiguously to harbor a compact object of $\simeq 7M_\odot$ (Orosz & Bailyn 1997). Since its discovery, GRS 1915+105 has displayed an extraordinary richness in variability in the X-ray band (Greiner, Morgan & Remillard 1996, Chen, Swank & Taam 1997, Belloni et al. 1997), in the IR and radio bands (Fender et al. 1997, Pooley & Fender 1997). Recent (Eikenberry et al. 1997, Mirabel et al. 1997) simultaneous multiwavelength observations of this superluminal source show a strict link between activity in the inner accretion disk and plasma ejections.

In this paper we estimate the minimum kinetic power associated with the ejections and investigate the possible energy transport mechanism from the compact source to distances where the radio blobs are resolved, showing that the more suitable solution implies the presence of a strong magnetic field at the footpoint of the jet.

In section 2 we summarize the existing radio and IR data of the ejection events. In section 3 we directly calculate the minimum kinetic power during the ejection. In section 4 we investigate the possible origin of the kinetic power. In section 5 we summarize the main results of the paper and discuss their consequences.

2 OBSERVATIONAL CONSTRAINTS DURING THE OUTFLOWS

Radio observations show that GRS 1915+105 in its active state is characterized by the increase of the flux level from $S_\nu < 10$ mJy to $S_\nu \sim 100$ mJy, the so called *plateau* state, on the top of which radio *flares* are superimposed, with durations from days to a month and fluxes up to a few Jy (Foster et al. 1996). The spectra during the plateau state are generally flat or inverted, $\alpha \leq 0$ (with $S_\nu \propto \nu^{-\alpha}$), probably indicating synchrotron self-absorption. On the other hand the spectra of radio flares reveal a transition from optically thick to thin ($\alpha > 0$) emission during the rise stage, with spectra harder ($\alpha \sim 0.5$) when the fluxes reach the maximum and softer ($\alpha \sim 1$) during the subsequent decay, generally interpreted as indicator of synchrotron radiation of an expanding radio cloud.

Observations with the Very Large Array and multiwavelength campaigns (with VLA and UKIRT simultaneously) pointed out that some strong radio flares are related with the ejection of radio clouds. There are two different kind of ejections: 1) *major ejections* as the prominent radio outburst of March 1994 (Mirabel & Rodriguez 1994), where the ejecta actually moved for several weeks along a direc-

arXiv:astro-ph/9810029v1 2 Oct 1998

tion forming an angle $\theta = 70^\circ$ to the line of sight, with bulk velocity of $0.92c$ and expansion at $\sim 0.2c$, with a spectral index change from $\alpha = 0.49$ (when the blobs could not be resolved) to $\alpha = 0.84$ (when the two condensations had moved apart); and 2) so-called “baby jets” (Eikenberry et al. 1997, Mirabel et al. 1997): quasi-periodic oscillations in the radio flux, coupled with similar oscillations in X-ray and IR bands and interpreted as scaled-down (in space and time) ejections of synchrotron emitting expanding blobs. The analysis of QPOs in IR and radio bands clearly shows that there is a time shift of flux peaks, with short wavelengths peaking first: the IR ($2\ \mu\text{m}$) peak precedes the 2 cm peak, that precedes the 3.6 and 6 cm peaks.

It must be emphasized that in one occasion (July 1995) also in the near-infrared K band ($\lambda = 2.2\ \mu\text{m}$) a jet was observed, with the same position angle of the radio jet, and near-infrared magnitude of $K=13.9$ (slightly brighter than the total source magnitude at its weakest measured value of $K=14.3$) and separated from the central source by $0.3''$ (Sams et al. 1996).

3 MINIMUM KINETIC POWER CONDITION

In order to deduce the minimum kinetic luminosity L_k related to a major ejection we consider the March 1994 event for which the observational data are the most exhaustive. Since we are interested more in power rather than in energy estimates, we follow an alternative way with respect to the standard one, that consists to determine first the internal energy of the blob via the minimum energy criterium and then to obtain an estimate of the kinetic power, by making some (highly uncertain) assumptions about the energization time.

We instead directly calculate the kinetic power, equal to the energy flux through a cross section of the jet (see also Ghisellini & Celotti, 1998). This energy flux can be carried by particles and by the toroidal magnetic field, and correspondingly we have

$$L_{k,p} = \pi R^2 \Gamma^2 \beta c n' < \gamma > m_e c^2 \left(1 + \frac{m_+}{m_e < \gamma >} \right) \quad (1a)$$

$$L_{k,B} = \pi R^2 \Gamma^2 \beta c U_B \quad (1b)$$

where m_+ is either m_p in the case of a “normal” $e-p$ plasma or $< \gamma > m_{e^\pm}$ for $e^\pm$ pairs, Γ is the Lorentz factor of the bulk motion, R is the cross section radius of the jet, n' in the comoving particle density, U_B is the magnetic energy density measured in the comoving frame and $< \gamma >$ is the mean Lorentz factor of the electrons, as measured in the comoving frame. A lower limit on n' can be estimated by the observed synchrotron emission L_{syn} of the blob. Assuming a spherical emitting volume of radius R , the number density of leptons producing the observed radiation is

$$n' = \frac{9L_{syn}}{2 < \gamma^2 > \delta^4 \sigma_{TC} B^2 R^3} \quad (2)$$

where $< \gamma^2 >$ is averaged over the relativistic electron distribution, and $\delta = [\Gamma(1 - \beta \cos \theta)]^{-1}$ is the Doppler factor. The B^{-2} dependence of the estimated particle density allows to minimize the total power $L_{k,p} + L_{k,B}$ with respect

to the magnetic field, since both the bulk Lorentz factor Γ ($=2.55$) and the viewing angle θ ($=72^\circ$) are known:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial B} (L_{k,p} + L_{k,B}) \equiv 0 \quad (3)$$

yielding the value of the magnetic field B_{min} corresponding to the minimum power:

$$B_{min} = \left[\frac{36\pi L_{syn} f m_e c^2}{R^3 \delta^4 \sigma_{TC}} \right]^{1/4}, \quad (4)$$

where f is a parameter directly related to the shape of the electron energy distribution, and therefore to the shape of the synchrotron radiation they emit:

$$f \equiv \frac{< \gamma >}{< \gamma^2 >} \left(1 + \frac{m_+}{m_e < \gamma >} \right). \quad (5)$$

Since the radio emission is a power law with spectral index $\alpha \sim 0.5$, the particle distribution $N(\gamma) \propto \gamma^{-2}$ between γ_1 and γ_2 , yielding $f \sim \ln(\gamma_2/\gamma_1)/\gamma_2 \{1 + m_+/m_e [\gamma_1 \ln(\gamma_2/\gamma_1)]\}$. With $R \sim 7 \times 10^{15}$ cm (geometric average of the size of blob of GRS 1915+105, assuming a distance of 12.5 kpc), $L_{syn} = 10^{33}$ erg s $^{-1}$ and $\beta = 0.92$ (corresponding to $\Gamma = 2.55$), we obtain $B_{min,ep} = 0.12$ G and $B_{min,e^\pm} = 0.036$ G if $f = 1.8$ ($\gamma_1 = 1$ and $\gamma_2 = 10^3$, as required for production of the observed synchrotron photons at $\nu \sim 300$ GHz). A low energy cut-off in the particle distribution would decrease somewhat B_{min} ($B_{min,ep} = 0.054$ G and $B_{min,e^\pm} = 0.031$ G for $\gamma_1 = 30$), while the high energy cut-off is consistent with the production of the observed radiation at 300 GHz (with $B = B_{min}$). However, the dependence of B_{min} on the extremes of the electron distribution is rather weak ($B_{min} \propto f^{1/4}$).

Note that the value $B_{min,ep} = 0.12$ is almost a factor 3 greater than the one obtained by Mirabel & Rodriguez (1995) and Liang & Li (1995), while it substantially agrees with the value estimated from the requirement of optical transparency of the plasmoid with respect to synchrotron self absorption (Atoyan & Aharonian 1997).

With a magnetic field value equal to B_{min} , the particle kinetic power and the Poynting flux are nearly equal, and the total power

$$L_{k,tot} = \frac{3\Gamma^2 \beta c}{2\delta^2} \left[\frac{\pi m_e c^2 R L_{syn} f}{\sigma_{TC}} \right]^{1/2} \quad (6)$$

is, respectively for $e-p$ plasma and $e^\pm$ pairs,

$$\sim 3.3 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sim 2.9 \times 10^{39} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$$

This is the minimum kinetic luminosity involved in major ejection events, calculated assuming $\gamma_1 = 1$ and $\gamma_2 = 10^3$ ($L_{k,tot,ep} \sim 6.4 \times 10^{39}$ erg s $^{-1}$ and $L_{k,tot,e^\pm} \sim 2.1 \times 10^{39}$ erg s $^{-1}$ if $\gamma_1 = 30$).

Setting $B = B_{min}$ in equation (2) the total numbers of emitting particles in the magnetic cloud are respectively $N'_{e^-} = 5.9 \times 10^{47}$ and $N'_{e^\pm} = 6.9 \times 10^{48}$, corresponding to internal energies

$$E_i \equiv m_e c^2 \int \gamma N(\gamma) d\gamma = N < \gamma > m_e c^2$$

$$\sim 3.3 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg}, \quad \sim 3.9 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg} \quad (7)$$

These internal energies can be compared with the corresponding kinetic energies in bulk motion E_k given by

$$E_k = L_k t \simeq L_k \frac{R}{\beta c} \\ \sim 8.5 \times 10^{45} \text{ erg} \quad \text{and} \quad \sim 7.4 \times 10^{44} \text{ erg} \quad (8)$$

where t is the time needed for the blob to cross the jet section.

4 ORIGIN OF THE KINETIC LUMINOSITY

The kinetic power calculated above refers to the radio emitting blob, at a huge distance from the putative black hole and accretion disk. The most economic assumption is that this power is approximately conserved along the jet, with very small dissipation giving rise, e.g., to the random particle energy responsible for the emission. If not, we would have to assume that at the base of the jet an even larger value of L_k is produced. In principle there are several possible energy carriers: $e^\pm$ pairs, $p - e^-$, pure magnetic field or a mixture of these components. Consider also that the particles can in principle be “hot” or “cold”: at large distances at least some of the electrons are “hot” (indeed, in our estimates we assumed that all the electrons are “hot”, since this is the most economic assumption), however these “hot” particles cannot come directly from the inner region (see below), but need to be accelerated or reaccelerated, therefore for the inner jet energy carriers one has to consider both cases. Furthermore, we have to note that in the “hot” case, the particle random energy, increasing the mass, can contribute to the kinetic power. Let us examine the possible cases.

4.1 “Cold” $e^\pm$ pairs

If the kinetic power is carried by a pure $e^\pm$ cold pair plasma, we can calculate the corresponding pair density and scattering optical depth at some jet radius R close to the base of the jet

$$\tau_\pm = \sigma_T R n_\pm = \frac{\sigma_T L_k}{\pi R \Gamma^2 \beta m_e c^3} \\ \sim 4.2 \times 10^2 \frac{L_k}{2.9 \times 10^{39} \text{ erg s}^{-1}} \frac{10^7 \text{ cm}}{R} \quad (9)$$

since the annihilation time-scale is of the order of $R/(c\tau_\pm)$, cold pairs cannot survive annihilation.

4.2 “Hot” $e^\pm$ pairs

If the pairs are relativistic, with average random Lorentz factor $\langle \gamma \rangle$, the above estimate of $\tau_\pm$ decreases by a factor $\langle \gamma \rangle$. In addition, the annihilation cross section decreases. However these relativistic pairs are embedded in a dense radiation field, produced by the accretion disk, and they cool on time-scales shorter than the dynamical time-scale. In a region of size R_d the radiation energy density due to the accretion disk luminosity L_d produced within R_d is of the order of $U_d = L_d/(4\pi R_d^2 c)$. The ratio between the inverse

Compton cooling time and the dynamical time R_d/c for a particle of Lorentz factor γ is

$$\frac{t_{IC}}{R_d/c} = \frac{4\pi R_d m_e c^3}{\sigma_T L_d \gamma} \ll 1 \quad (10)$$

A large fraction of L_k would be lost and converted into radiation, contrary to what observed. We therefore conclude that a pure $e^\pm$ pair plasma cannot carry the kinetic power, irrespective of whether it is hot or cold.

4.3 “Normal” $e - p$ plasma

The case of electrons with average random Lorentz factor $\langle \gamma \rangle$ greater than m_p/m_e and cold protons is analogous to the above case: inverse Compton scattering of seed accretion disk photons cools the electrons in a time shorter than R_d/c .

The case of “hot”, relativistic protons is instead immune to radiative losses, and the main concern comes from the needed confining pressure. If the kinetic power is carried by protons with an average Lorentz factor $\langle \gamma_p \rangle$, the corresponding (comoving) pressure is of the order of their energy density. If the confinement is magnetic, the required value of the magnetic field is

$$B = \left(\frac{8L_k}{R^2 \Gamma^2 \beta c} \right)^{1/2} \quad (11)$$

which is equal to the value that the magnetic field must have if it is the main carrier of the kinetic power.

If both electrons and protons are cold, the electron scattering optical depth is a factor m_p/m_e smaller than the one of equation (9), i.e. of the order of a few. There are no severe limits in this case: the Compton drag is not sufficient to slow down the plasma in the jet. It is however useful to estimate the predicted power emitted by the Compton drag process, because it can turn out to be important in sources where the jet is more aligned with the line of sight. For this simple estimate we will assume that the jet is Compton thick (i.e. $\tau_T > 1$), so that the effective cross section of the process is the geometrical one, i.e. πR^2 . As before, we assume that the accretion disk produces the luminosity L_d within the region $R_d > R$, at the typical frequency ν_d . With these hypotheses, the observed bulk Compton luminosity L_{bC} is

$$L_{bC} \sim \left(\frac{R}{R_d} \right)^2 \frac{L_d}{4} \Gamma^2 \delta^4 \quad (12)$$

Most of this luminosity is observed at the frequency $\nu \sim \delta \Gamma \nu_d$. With $R/R_d \sim 1/10$, $L_d \sim 10^{39} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ and $\delta = 0.57$ we obtain $L_{bC} \sim 1.7 \times 10^{36} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ and $\nu \sim \nu_d$. This radiation is therefore unobservable in the case of the known galactic superluminals, which are both observed with large viewing angles, but may be very important for sources with $\delta \sim \Gamma \gg 1$ (see also Sikora et al., 1997).

4.4 Poynting vector

The value of the magnetic field needed to carry L_k in the vicinity of the black hole is equal to equation (11), if the bulk of the magnetic field is moving with Γ , while the B -value before acceleration is a factor Γ greater, corresponding to $B \sim 3 \times 10^8 \text{ G}$ at $R = 10^7 \text{ cm}$.

It must be remarked that the standard theory of accretion disks (Shakura & Sunyaev 1973) predicts that the

maximum possible magnetic field at a given R/R_S (where R_S is the Schwarzschild radius) in a radiation dominated disk is $B \propto (M/M_\odot)^{-1/2}$, so that microquasars will have magnetic fields $\sim 10^4$ stronger than those in quasars. Therefore, the theoretical estimate $B \sim 10^2 - 10^4$ G obtained with the Blandford & Payne model (Blandford & Payne 1982) near the massive black holes in active galactic nuclei, clearly show that in microquasars $B \sim 10^8$ G can easily be attained.

Note that this value of the magnetic field would be of the same magnitude of the magnetic field required by the Blandford–Znajek (1977) process to produce L_k by extracting the rotational energy of a 10 solar mass Kerr black hole:

$$L_{rot} = 10^{41} B_9^2 M_1^2 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \quad (13)$$

where $B = 10^9 B_9$ G and $M = 10 M_1$ solar masses.

From the above arguments we conclude that $e^\pm$ or relativistic electrons with $\langle \gamma \rangle$ greater than m_p/m_e cannot carry L_k in the inner region of the jet, while protons and the Poynting vector can.

An alternative solution could be that the energy, carried in the inner region by “normal” cold plasma or toroidal magnetic field, is converted in $e^\pm$ pairs at large distance from the black hole and accretion disk. Pairs are produced most efficiently through photon–photon collisions, but this requires a powerful γ -ray continuum. Since the maximum efficiency in converting pairs in this way is of the order of 10 per cent (Svensson 1987), the high energy luminosity has to exceed $10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, to produce a kinetic power of the order of $10^{39} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. This luminosity is not observed. Therefore we conclude that $e^\pm$ pairs do not play any role as energy carriers along the jet and the minimum kinetic luminosity involved in major ejection events is given by the value estimated for $e - p$ plasma ($\sim 3 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$).

There are no strong observational arguments to decide between protons and the Poynting vector, unless we observe a new galactic superluminal at a small viewing angle. Note however that if L_k is initially carried by a large magnetic field there is the possibility to tap a great reservoir of energy (the rotational energy of the black hole) and to accelerate the plasma to relativistic speeds.

We therefore conclude that the kinetic power carried initially by the magnetic field is the most economic way to explain the observed energetics. Differential accretion disk rotation or rotating black holes can amplify magnetic fields to the required values, and the magnetic field will then accelerate particles to relativistic speeds.

The amount of matter present at the base of the jet may not be negligible, especially if magnetic field lines help to channel particles from the disk to the jet. We can compare the inflow rate $\dot{M}_{in}$ of the accretion process with the outflow rate $\dot{M}_{out}$ necessary to account for the kinetic power, in particles, of the radio blob. If we write the accretion luminosity, as usually, as $L_{acc} = \eta \dot{M}_{in} c^2$, and the kinetic power as $L_k = (\Gamma - 1) \dot{M}_{out} c^2$, we derive

$$\dot{M}_{out} = \frac{\eta}{\Gamma - 1} \frac{L_k}{L_{acc}} \dot{M}_{in} \quad (14)$$

Since $\eta \sim 0.1$ and $L_k \sim 10 L_{acc}$ we have that the inflowing and the outflowing mass rates are comparable. This in

turn suggests that most of the matter in the jet may come from the accretion disk.

5 THE EJECTION TIME

Another important question concerns the duration of the ejection events. When the blob becomes visible in the radio, it has a size of a few light days. It seems unlikely that it corresponds to an ejection duration lasting more than that, while a shorter ejection time may be possible. In the latter case the requirement on the initial kinetic power correspondingly increases. Note that direct radio observations of flare events do not directly constrain the ejection time, since the radio flux eventually produced in the first parts of the jet is heavily self absorbed. Again, the minimum power requirements criterium favours ejection events which last for $t_{out} \sim$ few days. This corresponds to $\sim 10^9 R_{S,10}/c$, where $R_{S,10}$ is the Schwarzschild radius for a 10 solar mass black hole. *The immediate consequence is that the ejection event must be considered as a continuous and stationary process.* Scaling for a superluminal active galactic nucleus, we would have, for a 10^9 solar mass black hole, an ejection phase lasting for 2×10^5 years.

6 DISCUSSION

We have obtained a reliable lower limit to the kinetic power corresponding to major ejection events in superluminal galactic sources, in particular for GRS 1915+105. This limit is of the order of $3 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, much greater than the observed radiative luminosity, which is probably Eddington limited to values of the order of $10^{39} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, corresponding to a black hole of 10 solar masses. This by itself suggests that the jet acceleration mechanism cannot be radiative.

We have investigated the role of $e^\pm$ pairs, of normal plasma and of the magnetic field as energy carriers of the kinetic power in the inner jet regions, excluding an important role for the $e^\pm$ pairs, and favouring a scenario in which the initial acceleration phase is controlled by a magnetic field of the order of 10^8 Gauss or more, able to channel and accelerate accretion disk matter in the jet.

Conservation of kinetic power dictates that the injection time-scale is of the order of a day, a very long time-scale if measured in units of the light crossing time of a 10 solar mass Schwarzschild radius, indicating a stationary, not impulsive, process. Shorter injection times, albeit possible, correspond to larger kinetic powers, exacerbating the problem of how to obtain them. The rough equality between the value of the magnetic field needed to carry the kinetic power in the inner jet and the value necessary to tap the rotational energy of a Kerr black hole via the Blandford & Znajek process can be regarded as circumstantial evidence that this process is indeed the one responsible for the jet formation and acceleration. This process is candidate to power also the jets in radio-loud quasars, and we can compare the results obtained here with the corresponding estimates of the kinetic power of AGN, as derived by Celotti, Padovani & Ghisellini (1997) for a sample of radio-loud sources. For those AGNs, the above authors find a kinetic power between 10^{45} and $10^{48} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, of the same order of the luminosity needed

to ionize the broad line region of the same objects, and in agreement with the power required by the existence of the outer radio lobes. In the AGN case the kinetic and the accretion luminosity are roughly equal, while in the galactic superluminal objects the kinetic power dominates. Another, obvious, difference is the Lorentz factor of the bulk motion, much greater in the AGN case. This results in a ratio of the outflowing to infalling mass rate $\dot{M}_{out}/\dot{M}_{in}$ of order unity for the galactic superluminals and two orders of magnitude smaller for AGN. These estimates makes the galactic superluminal sources the most efficient engines to produce collimated relativistic bulk motion, with the possible exception of gamma-ray bursts.

REFERENCES

- Atoyan & Aharonian 1997, MNRAS in press
 Belloni, T., Mendez, M., King, A. R., van der Klis, M. & van Paradijs, J. 1997, ApJ 479, L145
 Blandford, R.D & Znajek, R.L. 1977, MNRAS, 179, 433
 Blandford, R.D & Payne, D.G. 1982, MNRAS, 199, 8833
 Castro-Tirado, A.J., Brandt, S. & Lund, S. 1992, IAU Circ. 5590
 Celotti, A., Padovani, P. & Ghisellini, G., 1997, MNRAS, 286, 415
 Chen, X., Swank, J.H. & Taam, R.E. 1997, ApJ 477, L41
 Eikenberry, S.S., Mattheus, K., Morgan, E.H., Remillard, R.A. & Nelson, R.W. 1997, ApJ in press
 Fender, R.P., Pooley, G.G., Brocksopp, C. & Newell, S.J. 1997 MNRAS 290, L65
 Foster, R.S., Waltman, E.B., Tavani, M., Harmon, B.A., Zhang, S.N., Paciesas, W.S. & Ghigo, F.D. 1996, ApJ 467, L81
 Ghisellini G. & Celotti A., 1998, submitted to MNRAS
 Greiner, J., Morgan, E.H. & Remillard, R.A. 1996, ApJ 473, L107
 Landau, L.D. & Lifshitz, E.M. 1963, Electrodynamics of Continuous Media, Pergamon, Oxford
 Liang, E. & Li, H. 1995, A&A 298, L45
 Meier, D. 1996, ApJ 459, 185
 Mirabel, I.F. & Rodriguez, L.F. 1994, Nature 371, 46
 Mirabel, I.F. & Rodriguez, L.F. 1995, 17th Texas Symp. on relativistic astroph. New York Acad. of Sc.
 Mirabel, I.F., Dhawan, V., Chaty, S., Rodriguez, L.F., Marti, J., Robinson, C.R., Swank, J.H. & Geballe, T.R. 1997 A&A in press
 Orosz, J.A. & Bailyn, C.D. 1997, ApJ 477, 876
 Pooley, G.G., & Fender, R.P. 1997, MNRAS in press
 Rees, M.J. 1966, Nature 211, 468
 Sakura, N.I. & Sunyaev, R.A. 1973 A&A 24, 337
 Svensson R., 1987, MNRAS, 227, 403
 Sams, B.J., Eckart, A. & Sunyaev, R.A. 1996, Nature 382, 47
 Sikora, M., Madejski, G., Moderski, R. & Poutanen, J., 1997, ApJ 484, 108